

Appl. No. 10/691,104
Reply to Office Action of April 6, 2005

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the thorough examination reflected in the Office Action dated April 6, 2005.

Applicant also appreciates the Examiner's indication that dependent claims 4, 5 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. To expedite the prosecution of this application, this Response amends independent claims 1 and 7 to include the limitations of claims 4 and 10, respectively, and cancels claims 4 and 10 without prejudice. This Response also rewrites claim 5 in independent form. This response also amends claims 8-9 and 11-16 so that those claims now properly depend from claim 7, either directly or indirectly. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 1-3 and 6; 5; and 7-9 and 11-16, are now in condition for allowance.

This response also amends claims 17-18 to correct matters of form and to change the dependency of claim 18 so that it now depends from claim 17. To expedite prosecution of this application, Applicant also cancels claims 19 and 20 without prejudice.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-18 (16 total claims; 4 independent claims) remain pending in the application. With respect to the rejections of claims 17 and 18, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph

The Office rejects claims 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph since there is insufficient antecedent basis for the recitation "said first processor" appearing in those claims. Applicant amends claim 7 to recite a "first processor" and amends the dependencies of claims 11 and 13 so that they now depend from claim 7. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant submits that the rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/691,104
Reply to Office Action of April 6, 2005

Art-Based Rejections

The Office rejects claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13-15, 17-18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schofield et al. (US 2003/0001734), rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Porter et al. (US 6,745,624), rejects claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McClelland et al. (US 6,710,708), rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schofield et al. (US 2003/0001734), and rejects claims 12 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schofield et al. (US 2003/0001734) further in view of Porter et al. (US 6,745,624).

As noted above, the rejections of claims 1-3 and 6; 5; and 7-9 and 11-16 are moot in light of the above amendments. The rejections of claims 4, 10, and 19-20 are moot in light of the above cancellation of those claims.

With respect to the rejections of claims 17-18, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claims 17 and 18

Amended independent claim 17 relates to an apparatus which comprises:

an electronic automotive tire pressure monitor receiver configured to relearn associations between tire pressure transmitter identification codes and locations for vehicle tires based at least partially upon a user-supplied tire pressure change to each tire in a predetermined order. (Emphasis added.)

Applicant's specification discusses examples of the identification codes at, for example, paragraphs [0015] and [0017]. Paragraph [0015] discusses that transmitter 156 transmits tire pressure data and unique tire pressure detector identification codes to the tire pressure monitor receiver 130, and that each tire pressure detector has a unique tire pressure detector identification code, or ID number. Association of the ID number with a particular tire location 112, 114 enables the monitor receiver 130 to know from which tire location 112, 114 the data is being received. Paragraph [0017] further describes that the unique identification codes may be numbers or bit patterns or any other identifiers. For example, a unique pulse repetition frequency, a transmission frequency, or a unique modulation scheme may be used as a unique identification code.

Appl. No. 10/691,104
Reply to Office Action of April 6, 2005

In rejecting original claim 17, the Office Action cites paragraph [0058] of the Schofield reference as allegedly teaching the features recited in claim 17. Paragraph [0058] of the Schofield reference discusses that a tire inflation monitoring system can be provided which includes an audible tire inflation indicator in addition to a visible tire inflation indicators. This system includes a tire pressure monitoring controller 118 that receives tire pressure level input signals 122a, 122b, 122c, 122d from tire pressure sensors 120a, 120b, 120c, 120d located, respectively, within the pressurized cavity of the front passenger-side tire, the front driver-side tire, the rear passenger-side tire and the rear driver-side tire (said tires mounted onto the respective wheels of a vehicle). The tire pressure monitoring controller 118 includes an antenna, a microprocessor and associated electronic circuitry and that preferably includes user actuation/manual input elements such as switches or buttons or voice actuated input elements that allow a driver select, for example, a particular tire for display of its tire pressure or change the display from Imperial units to Metric units or enter a "training" mode. In this training mode "the driver can identify to the controller the location of a tire sensor on a particular wheel of the vehicle so that, during, for example, a tire rotation, the controller can learn which sensor is on what wheel such as by, for example, the driver "burping" tire pressure on a particular identified wheel such as the front passenger-side wheel when the system is in "learning" mode so that the controller can associate that particular wireless broadcast signal with that particular wheel." (Schofield at [0058]; emphasis added.)

However, Applicant submits that the Schofield reference fails to disclose, for example, that the tire inflation indicator system 116 is configured to relearn associations between tire pressure transmitter identification codes and locations for vehicle tires based at least partially upon a user-supplied tire pressure change to each tire in a predetermined order. Thus, Applicant submits that the Schofield reference fails to teach, for example, "pressure monitor receiver configured to relearn associations between tire pressure transmitter identification codes and locations for vehicle tires," as required by claim 17.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that amended claim 17, and its dependent claim 18, are patentable over the cited references. In addition, Applicant submits that many of the dependent claims are separately patentable since the cited references fail to teach recitations present in those claims.

Appl. No. 10/691,104
Reply to Office Action of April 6, 2005

In conclusion, for at least the reasons noted above, Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to further discuss this application, Applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at (313) 665-4710.

If for some reason Applicants have not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent abandonment on this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 07-0960 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,



Laura C. Hargitt
Reg. No. 43,989